



## Chapter 4 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### 4.1 Assessment of Goals and Objectives

The community development program to assist businesses did not meet its stated goal of assistance to 1,500 businesses during FY2006. The number of businesses provided assistance this year was 1,205. It is believed that, because so many small, neighborhood businesses were adversely affected by the rapidly increasing commercial rental rates in the District, program managers were generally required to devote a more intense level of service to each business. This is essentially a signal of increased demand for the services. In order to combat this effect, DHCD has invested more funds to non-profits that provide this service during FY2007. It is also noted that there is some volatility in the ongoing demand for these services. The FY2005 goal was initially 300 but was revised upward during the year. The final number of businesses assisted during FY2005 was 1,876. In addition, the program's impact will be monitored much more closely in FY2007.

**Table 11: Summary of Specific Community Development Objectives FY2006**

Specific Objectives	Sources of Funds	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Outcome/Objective*
Community Development					
(Neighborhood Revitalization) Support retention and growth of local neighborhood businesses	CDBG	• No. of businesses assisted	1500*	1,205	EO-3
Infrastructure					
Infrastructure Objectives may include business infrastructure improvements funded with local funds. See Economic Development Objectives.	CDBG	• No. of persons assisted			SL-3
Public Facilities					
There are no specific public facility objectives in this Plan; public facilities activities are undertaken as part of Development Finance Division Project Finance (see Appendix A)					
Public Services					
See Neighborhood-Based Activities discussion.	CDBG				SL-3
Economic Development					
Foster job growth for local residents	CDBG	• No. of temporary construction jobs through funded developments	2,000	3,547	SL-3
Support property management (through RLA-RC)	CDBG	• No. of housing units • No. of affordable units • No. of persons assisted • No. of businesses assisted	94	34	SL-3
Enhance function and appearance of business facilities to strengthen commercial corridors.	CDBG	• No. of businesses assisted	100	120	SL-3
Planning/Administrative					
Conduct program monitoring activities	CDBG, HOME		60	90	SL-3



Specific Objectives	Sources of Funds	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Outcome/Objective*
Carryout the Department's Administrative Management Program	CDBG, HOME				

## 4.2 Community Development & Organization Support

### A. Assistance to Residents

DHCD provided housing counseling to 15,528 tenants, homeowners and potential homeowners through community based organizations, and assisted at least 4,162 tenants subject to expiring federal subsidies.

### B. Small Business and Commercial Corridor Development

The Department did not meet its intended goal of providing assistance to 1,500 businesses for the year. Instead the Department through grants with neighborhood based non-profits provided assistance to only 1,205 businesses for the year. While this was a substantial increase over the assistance provided over the previous year, the shortfall reflects the rapid change in business needs in the DC economy. With a spike in land values, small business financial obligations, such as rapidly increasing commercial rents, have caught many small businesses unprepared. The grantees providing assistance to these businesses are adjusting to these changing needs as quickly as possible.

### C. Façade Improvements

One of the most important Neighborhood-Based Activities is to sponsor business façade redevelopment projects with local merchants. During FY2006, the Department's Storefront Façade Program continued to make significant strides in implementing new policies and parameters.

The Department has discovered that even though goals are set on an annual basis, the typical timeframe for façade completion is approximately 18 months. A Request for Façade Grant Applications was issued in May 2004 for FY 2005 façade activities. Six grantees were recommended for façade grant agreements as a result of that solicitation. Two of the grantees have since withdrawn their previously accepted applications. The sixth grantee continues to complete its requirements to begin construction in the program. In the interim, the Department spent a significant amount of time during FY2006 closing out its previous generation of façade grant projects, doing amendment work to a number of its existing façade grants, retooling the appropriate policies and parameters of the Façade Storefront Improvement Program, and gearing up to complete construction on the projects approved in FY 2005. Meanwhile, 18 façade improvement projects were completed in FY2006.

## 4.3 Large – Scale Economic Development

DHCD distinguishes between major economic development activity and community development at a neighborhood-scale. DHCD plays a supplemental role to the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development in economic development by supporting neighborhood-based



projects such as facade improvement and technical assistance to small businesses. The Department has also supported neighborhood economic health by providing development or public service support for community facilities.

As part of its RFP funding process, DHCD includes community and commercial facilities as a category for funding, based on neighborhood need. There is no specific set-aside, but historically about 4-8 qualified projects may be funded annually. For FY2006, DHCD funded four such facilities. These projects were:

1. Anacostia Gateway Center
2. Patricia Sitar Center for the Arts
3. Youth Recreation Center at St. Thomas More
4. Georgia Avenue Fatherhood Initiative

#### **4.4 Infrastructure**

DHCD promotes community development and job creation by contributing to infrastructure projects. These include the façade development projects described under “Community Organization Support.” DHCD also provides funds to the DC Housing Authority for site infrastructure improvements. In FY2006, DHCD provided a total of \$9,135,680 of capital funds to five projects as follows: \$535,680 for the construction of street infrastructure at the Anacostia Gateway Center, \$1,600,000 for site infrastructure associated with the Highland Addition Housing Development, \$2,000,000 for site infrastructure associated with the Henson Ridge HOPE VI project, \$2,500,000 for site infrastructure associated with the Arthur Capper HOPE VI project, and \$2,500,000 for the construction of site infrastructure associated with the Eastgate HOPE VI project.

#### **4.5 Program Changes**

While DHCD has used CDBG successfully to carry out its programs, DHCD nonetheless makes changes to its programs as needed.

- DHCD continues to strengthen the monitoring protocols for its Development Finance Division (DFD) programs and for the Neighborhood Investments Program,
- DHCD has completely revamped the Department’s first-time homebuyer assistance programs, by determining levels of assistance that more strongly relate to household income and prevailing real estate market prices; lowering requirements for the homebuyer’s contribution of cash toward the home purchase; and providing more favorable terms for loan repayment. The FY2006 changes had an immediate positive impact on the Department’s homebuyer assistance programs. Of the 278 first-time homebuyers provided DHCD assistance in FY2006, 115 (41%) were assisted in the final quarter of the year, following the program enhancements. This was a dramatic increase in the Department’s success toward facilitating homeownership, which had been on the decrease for the prior three years as a result of quickly escalating home sale prices in the District of Columbia. The settlement of 278 homebuyer loans also marked the first time in three years that DHCD exceeded its target of 240 first-time homebuyers assisted per year. For FY2007, the program is funded at a higher level overall, including increased funding through CDBG.



- DHCD's consolidated façade improvement program continues to implement more effective policies and procedures. Improvements are currently taking about 18 months to complete, and will be reported on a bi-annual completion cycle.

DHCD's programs have been designed to meet the HUD national objectives of benefiting low- and moderate-income persons, and elimination of slums and blight (through, for example, acquisition, disposition and rehabilitation).

#### 4.6 Anti-displacement and Relocation

It is DHCD's policy to minimize displacement in all of its projects. Each program officer in the DFD keeps track of any relocation required for a project. Project managers review developers' plans and revise those plans as necessary to minimize displacement. Where relocation is required, the project managers ensure, as part of the underwriting process, that the relocation plans are adequate and are funded as part of the project development costs. A number of DFD project managers have received training in the Uniform Relocation Act (URA). Development Finance also has convened a team to oversee project compliance, including URA compliance, and to update the Division's operating protocols to ensure that all specialized monitoring disciplines are being addressed.

In FY2006, five projects had tenants on site and required the submission and approval of temporary relocation plans. These projects were: Hunter Pines Apartments, Galen Terrace Apartments, Park Southern Apartments, Southview Apartments, and Fairmont I & II Apartments. The developers of these projects are temporarily relocating tenants to other vacant units on their project sites to the extent possible in order to avoid relocation to off-project sites.

Any required relocation generated by DHCD's single family rehabilitation projects is incorporated into each project work plan, and associated costs are factored into the budget.

#### 4.7 Source of Income

The Department relies on three sources of funding to finance housing and community development projects, programs, and delivery costs. These include federal resources from HUD; local and other funds, composed of appropriated District funds and certain loan repayments; and private investments that have been leveraged with public resources.

##### A. Federal Resources

FY2006 is the thirty-first year (CD-31) of CDBG Program. The Community Planning Division of HUD informed DHCD that its FY2006 formula entitlement grant allocations were as follows:

**Table 12: FY2006 Federal Entitlement Grant Allocations**

	<b>CDBG</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>ESG</b>	<b>HOPWA</b>	<b>LEAD</b>
<b>Allocation</b>	\$21,318,203	\$9,219,150*	\$821,555	\$10,535,000	\$2,300,284



	<b>CDBG</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>ESG</b>	<b>HOPWA</b>	<b>LEAD</b>
<b>Program Income</b>	\$14,834,162	\$1,472,829	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>FY 2005 *Carry Over</b>	\$67,413,212	\$7,457,912	\$930,373	\$0	\$2,300,285
<b>Net available federal funds</b>	\$103,565,577	\$18,149,891	\$1,751,928	\$10,535,000	\$2,300,285

\*Includes ADDI funds administered under HOME

\*Note: These carryover funds, which are shown as "Other" funds on the SF-424 forms, are not included in budget document that DHCD submits to the District of Columbia Council each year.

DHCD serve as the administrator for the CDBG, HOME, and ESG grants.<sup>2</sup> The regional HOPWA allocation is administered through and monitored by the D.C. Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration (HAA). Federal grant funds are distributed through DHCD's and HAA's various programs.

At the end of FY2003, the Department also received two lead-based paint grants from HUD's Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control: a Lead Hazard Control Grant for \$2,997,743 and a Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant for \$2,000,000. The District's match for these grants comes to \$4,482,071. For FY2006, DHCD will carryover \$ 2,300,284 of total lead grants for the lead hazard control and lead hazard deduction demonstration activities. The FY2006 local match for the Lead-Based Paint grants is \$3,154,060.

### Program Income

There was a total of \$14,834,162 in program income dollars collected for the CDBG and \$1,472,829 was collected in program income dollars for the HOME program. Program income was derived primarily from repayment of loans provided to citizen to assist in the purchase of homes within the District. Program income received in excess of the budgeted amount is reprogrammed for use with the respective program.

### B. Local Resources

According to the Mayor's FY2006 baseline budget, the funds received from District budget appropriations total \$2,030,870. Appropriated and local funds are broken down as follows:

**Table 13: FY2006 Local/Other Funds Allocations**

	<b>Housing Production Trust Fund</b>	<b>Local Appropriation</b>	<b>Loan Repayments</b>	<b>Other***</b>
<b>Allocation*</b>	\$116,586,473	\$2,030,870	\$6,222,350	\$1,575,775

\*Note: All dollar amounts are the Original Expense Budget Numbers.

\*\*\* "Other" consists of Land Acquisition and Housing Development Organization (LAHO) \$416K; Portal Sites \$46K; Rehab Repay \$400,000 and Low Income Housing Tax Credits of \$714K.

<sup>2</sup> In FY 2005, DHCD resumed the oversight and administration of ESG funds starting with the HUD grant year 2004. During 2002-2004, DHCD had transferred administration and management of the ESG program to the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Families and Elders. DHCD will work directly through the Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness and their sub-grantees in implementing homelessness strategies and programs.



The Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF or “Fund”), authorized by the Housing Production Trust Fund Act of 1988 as amended by the Housing Act of 2002, is a local source of money for affordable housing development. Capital for the HPTF is supplied from the legislated share of DC deed recordation taxes and real estate transfer taxes, currently 15%. The Fund is designed to direct assistance toward the housing needs of the most vulnerable District residents—very low- and extremely low-income renters. Pending the receipt of feasible project proposals, the statute requires that:

- A minimum of 40 percent of all Fund monies disbursed each year must benefit households earning up to 30 percent of the area median income (AMI);
- A second minimum of 40 percent of the Fund monies must benefit households earning between 31 and 50 percent of the AMI;
- The remainder must benefit households earning between 51 and 80 percent of the AMI; and
- At least 50 percent of the Fund monies disbursed each year must be used for the development of rental housing.

The rest of the funds may be used for for-sale housing development, single-family housing rehabilitation, and loans and title-clearing costs associated with the Homestead Program.

In FY2005, DHCD launched a new HPTF Site Acquisition Fund Initiative (SAFI) which combines Trust Fund money with private lender money to provide loans to non-profit housing developers to facilitate acquisition of sites for affordable housing. The rapid pace of the real estate market in the District of Columbia makes this initiative necessary to retain land parcels for the housing needs of low-to-moderate income residents.

DHCD also receives separate, local budget appropriation and loan repayments from its Home Purchase Assistance Program, which it uses to make more loans within these programs. Finally, under Other Funds, there was \$416,000 in Land Acquisition and Housing Development Organization (LAHDO) funds; \$400,000 for Rehab Repay; \$713,775 for the funding of monitoring related activities for the Low-Income Housing Tax Credits granted by the District; and \$46,000 from the “Portal Site”, which is revenue generated from District-owned parking lots and the disposition of District-owned property. The Portal Site revenue is a pass-through to the District and is budgeted for miscellaneous administrative expenses related to these activities.

### **C. Private Funds and Leveraging**

The grant award criteria for the District’s housing and community development programs require the maximum use of private financial resources. Because DHCD uses its funds to “close the gap” of needed financing for its selected projects, the private financing sector provides the bulk of each project’s funds. Banks and savings and loan institutions serve as the primary financing sources of all housing production, rehabilitation, or capital improvements and ongoing operations. Many banks have special community lending operations, partly in response to the provisions of the Community Reinvestment Act, which encourages local lenders to invest in affordable housing and other community support projects. Several local banks have been active in supporting nonprofit affordable housing development. The District’s public dollars leverage these private funds. DHCD





also works in tandem with non-profit and semi-governmental development organizations to leverage funds for affordable housing and economic opportunity. In addition, the District government and nonprofit developers have actively reached out to capture foundation grants. Many nonprofit organizations seek foundation funding to provide social support services, especially to special needs populations. Among the organizations that are active in this area are the Fannie Mae Foundation, Meyer Foundation, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), and the Enterprise Foundation.

### Matching Funds

Two HUD programs require matching funds: HOME and ESG. In addition, DHCD must provide matching funds for the lead-based paint grants received in FY 2004: the Lead Hazard Control Grant and the Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant.

Under 24 CFR 92.218 *et. seq.*, the District must provide a matching contribution of local funds to HOME-funded or other affordable housing projects as a condition of using HOME monies. The District's FY2006 contribution was 12.5 percent of its non-administrative HOME draws. (The District has received a 50 percent reduction in its match requirement for HUD Program Year 2003, which is the District's Fiscal Year 2004.)

DHCD meets its HOME obligation through contributions from the Housing Production Trust Fund, which is described on page 26. Eighty percent of all HPTF monies must benefit households earning up to a true 50 percent of the area median income, which is below the HOME income eligibility maximum; moreover, HPTF-assisted rental projects must be affordable for 30 years, which exceeds the HOME affordability period requirement. In FY2006, the Department's HPTF budget is \$100,886,474. As the Department incurs HOME match-eligible expenses, it will ensure that adequate funding is provided for the matching contribution.

The FY2006 local match for the Lead-Based Paint grants is \$3,154,060 and ESG match is \$20,783,137 in cash and fair market value of free shelter rent.

## 4.8 Uses of Funds

The following pages contain information on DHCD use of funds in FY2006 for affordable housing and community development projects by source and program. The total expenditure amount represents district's dollars spent in FY2006 and may differ from total expenditure on the IDIS reports because all funds were not drawn down as of September 30, 2006. The total expenditure for HOPWA may differ because IDIS report shows drawn downs for FY2005 and 2006.

Tables 14-17 display DHCD's FY2006 Budget allocations and use of federal funds in the CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA programs.

**Table 14: FY2006 CDBG Program (CD-29) Budget**

<b>1. Homeownership and Home Rehabilitation Assistance</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Cash/Accrued Expenditures</b>
a. Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP)	\$4,120,339	3,616,243
b. Single Family Residential Rehabilitation Program	2,581,289	2,215,344



c. Homestead Housing Preservation Program	443,979	398,424
d. Home Ownership Developer's Incentive Fund (HODIF)	150,000	150,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 7,295,607</b>	<b>\$6,380,011</b>
<b>2. Affordable Housing/Real Estate Development</b>		
a. Development Finance Division Project Funding	\$60,299,016	52,552,842
b. Tenant Apartment Purchase	416,200	415,275
c. Title VI	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$60,715,216</b>	<b>\$52,968,117</b>
<b>3. Neighborhood Investment</b>		
a. Neighborhood-Based Activities	\$8,299,043	\$6,530,797
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$8,299,043</b>	<b>\$6,530,797</b>
<b>4. Economic and Commercial Development</b>		
a. Economic Development	\$7,972	\$7,972
b. Real Estate Services and Property Management	102,320	16,015
c. National Capital Revitalization Corporation (RLA-RC)	20,453,238	19,846,560
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$20,563,530</b>	<b>\$19,870,547</b>
<b>5. Agency Management Program</b>	<b>\$5,321,113</b>	<b>\$4,122,016</b>
<b>6. Program Monitoring and Compliance</b>	<b>\$719,233</b>	<b>\$663,211</b>
<b>7. Agency Financial Operations</b>	<b>662,546</b>	<b>\$588,050</b>
<b>Total CDBG Program</b>	<b>\$103,576,288</b>	<b>\$91,122,749</b>

Table 15: FY2006 HOME Program Budget

1. Agency Management Program	BUDGET	Cash/Accrued Expenditure
a. Agency Management	\$119,613	\$119,613
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$119,613</b>	<b>\$119,613</b>
<b>2. Affordable Housing/Real Estate Development</b>		
a. DFD Project Financing	\$16,050,056	\$3,230,561
b. Tenant Apartment Purchase Activity	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$16,050,056</b>	<b>\$3,230,561</b>
<b>3. Homeownership and Home Rehabilitation Assistance</b>		
a. Home Purchase Assistance Program	\$1,394,787	\$1,383,667
b. Single Family Residential Rehabilitation	585,435	585,435
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,980,222</b>	<b>\$1,969,102</b>
<b>TOTAL HOME Program</b>	<b>\$18,149,891</b>	<b>\$5,319,276</b>

Table 16: FY2006 Emergency Shelter Grant Budget

Homeless Support and Prevention	BUDGET	Cash/Accrued Expenditures
Emergency Shelter Grant Management	\$1,751,927	\$449,795
<b>TOTAL ESG Program</b>	<b>\$1,751,927</b>	<b>\$449,795</b>



**Table 17: FY2006 Housing for Persons With AIDS Program EMSA-Wide Budget**

<b>HOPWA Eligible Activity</b>	<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>Cash/Accrued Expenditures</b>
1. Housing Information Services	\$411,000	388,000
2. Resource Identification	0	0
3. Acquisition, Rehab., Conversion, Lease, and Repair of Facilities	500,000	141,006.66
4. New Construction, Dwellings and Community Residences	0	0
5. Project-based Rental Assistance	800,000	1,469,103.10
6. Tenant-based Rental Assistance	6,691,070.80	5,781,498.17
7. Short-term rent, Mortgage, and Utility Payments	477,929	415,600.83
8. Supportive Services	1,074,071	1,171,193.57
9. Operating Costs	210,500	187,000
10. Technical Assistance	54,379.30	54,379.30
11. Administrative Expenses – 7% Cap	0	0
12. Administrative Expenses Grantee 3% Off the Top Total HOPWA Formula Award	316,050	316,050.00
<b>TOTAL HOPWA Program</b>	<b>\$10,535,000</b>	<b>\$8,923,890.97</b>

## 4.9 Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies

As part of the Five-Year Plan, DHCD continues the designation of its two Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs): 1) Georgia Avenue NRSA; and 2) Carver Terrace/Langston Terrace-Ivy City/Trinidad NRSA.

### 1. Georgia Avenue Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area

DHCD submitted an application for designation of the Georgia Avenue Corridor as a NRSA to HUD, in conjunction with the District of Columbia Fiscal Year 2000 Consolidated Plan.

DHCD extended that designation from 2006 into 2010. The city proposed to address economic development focused along the almost 5-mile corridor by approaching it as a single linear neighborhood. The Georgia Avenue Corridor has a distinct identity because it is one of the major north-to-south transportation routes connecting Maryland to downtown DC. The targeted area includes the 39 census blocks that abut Georgia Avenue from Florida Avenue, NW to Eastern Avenue, NW.

The NRSA development strategy includes job creation, housing and commercial development/rehabilitation, employment and entrepreneurial training and infrastructure improvements. A combination of projects and program activities has been identified in the NRSA supporting these initiatives to serve as the core tools for revitalizing the Corridor.

**Table 18: Georgia Avenue NRSA Performance Data**

<b>GOALS</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	<b>2006 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</b>
George Avenue Marketing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attract 2 employers with job opportunities for local residents to locate along Georgia Ave.</li> </ul>	Washington, DC Marketing Center, DMPED, NCRC	
Housing and Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rehabilitate 20 single-family homes at affordable rates for current residents by 2007</li> <li>Provide loans to assist in the rehab of multi-family units at rents affordable to current residents</li> <li>Provide Lead-safe Washington Services through Assessments and Amelioration of lead paint in low-income homes.</li> </ul>	DHCD, DCHA, DCHFA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19 units completed in last fiscal year</li> <li>HPAP had 8 home purchases</li> <li>First Right to Purchase Program assisted the tenants of 2922 Sherman Avenue NW (one block west of Georgia Avenue) to purchase their 13 unit building. Tenants have organized a Cooperative and will completely renovate the building.</li> <li>Assisted Georgia Avenue Family Support Collaborative<sup>4</sup> to purchase their building located at 1104 Allison Street NW at Georgia Avenue to continue providing family counseling services at that location.</li> </ul>
Small Business Development Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide entrepreneurial training to promote the retention and expansion of local businesses</li> <li>Provide small business management training</li> <li>Provide counseling to help prepare local residents for homeownership</li> </ul>	DHCD, DC Chamber of Commerce Foundation, DC Main Street Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided technical assistance to 336 new businesses</li> <li>Assisted 3 businesses in obtaining business registration and/or licenses</li> <li>Assisted 2 businesses with technical assistance in obtaining loans/credit</li> <li>Assisted 2 businesses in obtaining minority certification</li> </ul>
Sidewalk and Infrastructure Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resurface/redevelopment of sidewalks and infrastructure, including facades, to improve the appearance and safety of the commercial node.</li> </ul>	DDOT DHCD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sidewalk improvements completed at Sheridan and Georgia.</li> <li>Completed 8 storefront facades on Georgia Ave. in general and 12 façade improvements in the 6700 Block.</li> </ul>



GOALS	OBJECTIVES	RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES	2006 ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Acquisition and Redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acquire vacant and abandoned property along the corridor for redevelopment purposes</li> </ul>	NCRC, DHCD, DCHFA, Home Again Program	

## 2. Carver Terrace/Langston Terrace/Ivy City/Trinidad NRSA

DHCD applied to HUD for the designation of the Carver/Langston Terrace/Ivy City/Trinidad (CLTICT) communities as a NRSA in August 2000 for a period of five years. DHCD will extend that designation from 2006 into 2010. The CLTICT NRSA includes five census tracts defined by New York Avenue, Florida Avenue and Bladensburg Road, and includes Galludet University and the Farmer's Market, as well as major residential and light industrial developments.

The NRSA development strategy includes job creation, housing development, employment and entrepreneurial training, and infrastructure development. A comprehensive set of projects and programs has been developed around these four areas to serve as the core tools for revitalizing the neighborhood over the next five years.

**Table 19: Carver, Langston, Ivy City, Trinidad NRSA Performance Data**

GOALS	OBJECTIVES	RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES	2006 ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Housing and Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase homeownership opportunities for 50 new homeowners by 2010</li> <li>Provide assistance under the single-family residential rehab program and improve other 1-4 unit properties</li> <li>Provide Lead-Safe Washington Services in Ivy City/Trinidad through assessments and amelioration of lead paint in low-income units</li> </ul>	DHCD, Home Again Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 units completed in last fiscal year</li> <li>HPAP had 4 home purchases</li> </ul>
Employment and Entrepreneurial Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training and employment for 100 local residents by 2010 to help them prepare for the job market</li> <li>Conduct two career fairs each year.</li> </ul>	DOES, NSI	
Infrastructure Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to two community parks in the area.</li> <li>Construction of the Trinidad Recreation Center</li> <li>Redevelopment of Alexander Crummel School</li> </ul>	DDOT, DPR, DMPED, NSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction underway.</li> <li>No action on A. Crummel School.</li> <li>\$1 million in sidewalk/road improvements</li> </ul>



#### 4.10 Neighborhood Based Activities

**Housing Counseling Services:** Through non-profit Community Based Organizations (CBO), DHCD supports a broad range of housing counseling services, including program intake, community outreach, and citizen participation, with an emphasis on home ownership, eviction and mortgage default prevention, and preservation of existing housing placements. All costs are for the direct delivery of housing counseling services.

Sponsors: Housing Counseling Services, Inc.; Central American Resource Center; Lydia's House, Inc.; University Legal Services, Inc.; Marshall Heights Community Development Organization, Inc.; and Latino Economic Development Corporation; which are all local non-profits

Funding Source: CDBG Competitive Funding

Budget Amount: \$2,416,000

Total Expenditure: Approximately \$2,350,000

Anticipated Outcome Measure: 7,992 households counseled

Actual Outcome: 15,528 households counseled

Addresses of Sponsors: See Appendix B

**Commercial Corridor and Small Business Development:** Under this activity, DHCD targets intensive revitalization efforts in commercial corridors and neighborhoods that have experienced economic decline and physical decay. Through CBOs, funded projects help to support and strengthen existing businesses; broaden the commercial mix of stores, restaurants and services; provide technical assistance to for small businesses; and provide greater access to capital for small neighborhood based businesses. All costs are for the direct delivery of services or projects.

Sponsors: DC Chamber of Commerce Foundation, Latino Economic Development Corporation, Development Corporation of Columbia Heights, Marshall Heights Community Development Organization, Inc., and Washington Area Community Investment Fund, which are all local non-profits

Funding Source: CDBG Competitive Funding

Budget Amount: \$1,427,000

Total Expenditure: Approximately \$1,250,000

Anticipated Outcome Measure: 1500 businesses assisted

Actual Outcome: 1,205 businesses assisted

Addresses of Sponsors: See Appendix B

**Support for Tenants Subject to Expiring Federal Subsidy:** Under this activity, grantees will provide housing assistance services to residents of affordable multi-family properties for which federal housing subsidies are due to expire, or in which displacement is a strong possibility. Services to tenants will include early intervention for: tenant education on rights and opportunities under existing landlord-tenant law; tenant organizing and advocacy; evaluation for tenants' potential to exercise First Right to Purchase; referrals to legal assistance; and some relocation assistance when necessary. All costs are for the direct delivery of services.

Sponsors: Housing Counseling Services, Inc., Latino Economic Development Corporation, Development Corporation of Columbia Heights, MANNA Community Development Corporation, which are all local non-profits



Funding Source: CDBG Competitive Funding

Budget Amount: \$1,202,000

Total Expenditure: \$1,550,000

Anticipated Outcome Measure: 3,000 affordable units assisted

Actual Outcome: 4,162 affordable units assisted

Addresses of Sponsors: See Appendix B

**Storefront Façade Improvement:** The purpose of this activity is to enhance the image and overall economic viability of neighborhood business districts by improving the function and appearance of individual commercial façades. Under this activity, the Department will provide grants through non-profit partners to retail and commercial property owners for the enhancement of retail and commercial facades in targeted areas of the District. Generally, the Department will provide a grant of up to 80% of construction costs for façade improvements. Additional funds are provided to non-profits for administrative and management costs including outreach efforts, design fees, project management, and construction administration. All costs are for the direct delivery of services or completion of projects.

Sponsors: Emory Beacon of Lights, Inc., and Barracks Row Main Street, Inc., which are all local non-profits.

Funding Source: CDBG Competitive Funding

Budget Amount: \$402,046

Total Expenditure: \$0

Anticipated Outcome Measure: 22 units funded

Actual Outcome: 0 units completed; others under construction

Addresses of Sponsors: See Appendix B

#### **4.11 Antipoverty Strategy**

DHCD is not the lead agency in the District's direct efforts to reduce poverty, and the HUD entitlement program funds administered by DHCD are not the primary source of funds for anti-poverty activity by the District. However, by funding housing for extremely low, very-low and low-income residents DHCD contributes to the City's anti-poverty strategy by lifting families out of poverty and providing them with stable lodging and a means to build equity for the future. DHCD also supports other DC Government initiatives in reducing poverty and utilizes its federal and local funds to help residents improve their financial stability through housing and financial counseling programs conducted by a network of community-based organizations. DHCD also provides funds to CBOs to assist small businesses with technical assistance and to improve their physical appearance to retain and expand neighborhood job opportunities.

The comprehensive housing counseling services funded by DHCD provide tenants and prospective homeowners with assistance in such matters as household/home management and maintenance, improving credit, and household budgeting, all geared toward improving residents' opportunities to obtain and retain decent housing with the prospect of moving toward ownership and the development of equity. Residents of buildings with expiring Section 8 protections are provided targeted assistance in locating housing options, and are introduced to the DHCD-sponsored Tenant First Right to Purchase Program to move toward ownership.



The Tenant First Right to Purchase Program and the Tenant Apartment Purchase Assistance programs provide technical assistance, seed funds and “earnest” money to tenant groups to assist them in organizing so they are prepared to take advantage of their first right of refusal when a building is for sale. The program also provides new tenant owner groups with management/technical assistance. Converted buildings are also eligible to apply to DHCD for rehabilitation funding. During FY2006, DHCD provided 691 tenants with these services.

DHCD provides education and outreach to ensure that Fair Housing Laws are understood and that all residents are provided with information on their rights of access to housing in the District of Columbia. Assistance is provided in several languages. During FY2006, DHCD reached over 3,000 residents with fair housing information and/or assistance.

Other agencies play the key roles in the reduction of poverty. The Department of Human Services administers income support, welfare to work and a range of programs to support families and individuals. The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness provides emergency support from ESG funds to prevent eviction. The Office on Aging provides support services to seniors and partners with DHCD in the development of senior housing.

The Department of Employment Services (DOES) provides extensive job training opportunities through its city-wide “One Stop Service Centers.” The Workforce Investment Council (WIC) brings together private and public sector stakeholders to develop strategies to increase employment opportunities for DC residents and to support and to assist DOES in its employment mission. The DC Public School Administration has created career-oriented high schools in a number of specialized areas, including the Technology and Hospitality Industries to facilitate students progressing from school to real jobs in the DC market.

During FY2006, DHCD continued to play an important role in the Mayor’s new set of anti-poverty initiatives that directly target neighborhoods with high poverty and crime rates. The New Communities Initiative and the Great Street Initiative are being planned to address both physical and socio-economic-educational needs of the targeted areas—by combining government resources with those of private and non-profit developers or organizations to bring long-term and comprehensive revitalization to the designated area. “New Communities” is a comprehensive partnership to improve the quality of life for families and individuals living in distressed neighborhoods. The companion program, “Great Streets” is a strategy to revive the local commercial corridors bordering the new communities so that the balance of services that neighborhoods need are restored along with the housing and social fabric.

These two initiatives are a new and aggressive approach to fighting poverty that includes current residents and businesses in the planning for an inclusive neighborhood that attracts a mixture of incomes and families, singles, and elders into the revitalized neighborhoods.





## **Chapter 5 HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS (HOPWA)**

The District's, Department of Health, Administration for HIV Policy and Programs (AHPP) is the HOPWA Formula Grantee for the Washington, DC Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMA).

The purpose of AHPP is to prevent the spread of HIV infection and to ensure the management, oversight, planning, and coordination of HIV/AIDS services and Programs in the District of Columbia, in collaboration with other government and Community organizations. AHPP also administers the Ryan White Title I Program for the DC EMA, the District's Ryan White Title II, AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP), and Centers for Disease Control (CDC) funding for HIV/AIDS prevention and surveillance activities.

In addition to serving as the DC EMA regional grantee, AHPP is also the local administrative agency for the HOPWA program in the District of Columbia. In Suburban Maryland, the Prince George's County Government, DHCD is the administrative agency with oversight of activities in Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George's counties. The Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) is the administrative agency for suburban Virginia with oversight of activities in the counties Of Arlington, Clarke, Culpeper, Fairfax, Fauquier, King George, Loudoun, Prince William, Spotsylvania, Stafford, and Warren. NVRC's responsibility also includes the cities of Alexandria, Culpeper, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas, and Manassas Park. In suburban West Virginia, the administrative agency is the AIDS Network of the Tri-State Area (ANTS) a non-profit community-based organization with responsibility for Jefferson County.

AHPP continues to work in partnership with a number of CBOs in the effort to provide housing assistance and supportive services to persons living with HIV/AIDS in the District of Columbia. The District's community partners for the FY2006 program year include:

### **Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program**

- Building Futures
- Community Family Life Services
- DC CARE Consortium
- EFFORTS
- Greater Washington Urban League
- Homes for Hope
- La Clinica del Pueblo
- Our Children
- Perry School Community Service Center
- Terrific, Inc.

### **Facility Based Housing w/Supportive Services**

- Coates and Lane
- Damien Ministries
- EFFORTS
- Hill's Community
- Lurn and Urn
- Joseph's House
- Miriam's House
- RIGHT, Inc.
- Northwest Church Family Network

### **Facility Based Emergency Housing w/Supportive Services**

- Miracle Hands
- RAP, Inc.
- Our Place DC



### Supportive Services Only

- Miracle Hands
- Housing Counseling Services
- Coates and Lane
- DC CARE Consortium

**Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development** (Suburban Maryland) is the HIV/AIDS Administration (HAA) sub-grant Project Sponsor which includes: Prince George's County, Calvert County, and Charles County. The HOPWA Program in Suburban Maryland plays a vital role in assisting Marylanders who are challenged by HIV/AIDS.

Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) works in collaboration with the following HOPWA vendors:

### Tenant- and Project-Based Rental Assistance

- Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority
- Arlington County DHS, Section 8
- Loudoun County Dept. of Social Services, Housing
- Prince William Office of Housing and Community Development
- Northern Virginia Family Service
- Robert Pierre Johnson Housing Development Corporation
- Homestretch

### Permanent AIDS Residence

- Wesley Housing Development Corporation's Agape House

### Supportive Services

- Northern Virginia AIDS Ministry
- Legal Services of Northern Virginia

West Virginia continues to provide services for residents residing in Jefferson County through the AIDS Tri-State Network.

## 5.1 Specific HOPWA Objectives

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA): HOPWA funds were used to provide short-term supportive housing opportunities, tenant-based vouchers and mortgage/utility payments for 996 persons living with HIV/AIDS in the DC Statistical Metropolitan Area (SMA). Housing information services were provided to 2,173 persons, and 3,170 persons received supportive services in HOPWA-provided housing. Twenty-two (22) sub-grants were awarded to provide operating support to housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS.

**Table 20: Summary of Specific Special Needs Objectives for FY2006**

Specific Objectives	Sources of Funds	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Outcome/Objective*
Special Needs Objectives					
Provide housing information services to	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. of persons assisted</li> </ul>	1,450	2,173	DH-1



Specific Objectives	Sources of Funds	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Outcome/ Objective*
persons living with HIV/AIDS					
Provide and sustain short-term supportive housing opportunities to persons with HIV/AIDS	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of housing units</li> <li>No. with short-term rental assistance</li> <li>No. of homeless and chronically homeless households assisted</li> </ul>	1,639	996	DH-2
Provide supportive services to HOPWA-assisted housing	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of persons assisted</li> </ul>	635	3,170	DH-1
Provide operating support to housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of persons assisted</li> </ul>	30	38	DH-1
Assist communities to develop comprehensive strategies for HIV/AIDS housing, outreach and education	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of persons assisted</li> </ul>	30	38	SL-3
Acquisition, rehabilitation, conversion, lease, and repair of facilities (24 CFR 574.300.B.3)	HOPWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of housing units</li> <li>No. of affordable units</li> <li>No. of units designated for persons with HIV/AIDS</li> </ul>	30	0	DH-2
Other Special Needs Housing Units are included in the Objective #2 to preserve and increase affordable housing.			Part of 2000 units of affordable housing		

## 5.2 HOPWA FY2006 Program Accomplishment

Approximately \$7,661,016.00 of HOPWA funds were used to provide housing assistance to 4,407 individuals and families in the DC EMA. In the District of Columbia, HOPWA housing programs currently underway include three emergency housing, and seven facility-based housing sites that provide short-term housing and supportive services, Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) programs both in the District and all participating jurisdictions, Short-term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance (STRMU) programs, and Housing Information and Referral services. Of those that received housing assistance, STRMU was provided for individuals and families during the fiscal year.

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year WASHINGTON, D.C. EMA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	563	\$5,781,498.17	0	0	0	563
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	395	\$415,600.83	0	0	0	395
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	154	\$1,469,103.10	0	0	0	154



Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year WASHINGTON, D.C. EMA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	1,112	\$7,666,202	0	0	0	1,112
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,112	\$7,661,016.00	0	0	0	1,112

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions to Actual Accomplishments WASHINGTON D.C. EMA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	739	563
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	715	395
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	45	142
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	1,499	1,196
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	1,499	1,100

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

In the District, approximately 142 units of housing were available for individuals and families in supportive housing facilities from October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006. Clients were allowed to stay 30 days to 6 months, depending upon their level of need. With the assistance of the centralized housing intake/assessment program (Gate Keeper) and the strong network of housing providers, persons living with HIV/AIDS in need of housing assistance in the DC EMA were able to access HOPWA funded services.

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	305	\$3,599,409	0	0	0	305
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	176	\$118,085.83	0	0	0	176



Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	142	\$1,461,984	0	0	0	142
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	623	\$5,179,478.00	0	0	0	623
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	623	\$5,179,478.00	0	0	0	623

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions to Actual Accomplishments DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	315	305
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	350	176
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	45	142
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	644	623
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	644	623

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

In the District of Columbia in FY2006, HOPWA funds were used to provide:

- Housing assistance for 760 individuals and families in the form of emergency shelter, short term supportive housing, and TBRA; and STRUM.
- Supportive Services for individuals and families; which included mental health care, substance abuse treatment, need assessments, job readiness, job training and placement, transportation, case management services, and housing information and referral services to over 1,748 individuals.



## **A. Overview of Activities Carried Out**

In the District, Housing Program staff was instrumental in reaching out to new HOPWA service providers. This effort resulted in the downsize of the waiting list of 67 Persons with AIDS (PWAs) as of October 1, 2005 to 21 on the waiting list as of September 30, 2006 as 46 new TBRA vouchers were issued. The existing 88 PWAs on the current waiting list are a result of new applications received by the Gate Keeper during this reporting period. Two new agencies joined the network of housing providers offering TBRA for persons living with HIV/AIDS. Also, with the assistance of the long-term centralized housing and information referral center Gate Keeper for persons living with HIV/AIDS (PWAs), AHPP's HOPWA team was able to locate more housing and landlords willing to accept TBRA vouchers.

During the fiscal year HOPWA funds continued to support emergency housing, short-term supportive housing, the Multi Service Day Center for homeless persons living with HIV/AIDS in need of shelter during the day; TBRA vouchers, a Housing Mediation program that assists with landlord/tenant concerns, and short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance and the PWA Homeownership Program.

Within the fiscal year a potential \$1.0 million RFA was issued in the District of Columbia for housing providers and supportive services. The program areas included Facility-based Housing with Supportive Services (substance abuse), Facility-based Housing with Supportive Services for Men and Facility-based Housing with Supportive Services for Women. The HOPWA team, based on external and internal reviews, granted new awards that were to begin on October 1, 2006 and provided cost extensions to existing providers based on performance.

### **Suburban Maryland**

In FY2006, Suburban Maryland received \$2,731,861 in HOPWA funds to serve approximately 454 individuals and families. About \$158,750 was used for planning and administration. Major goals and activities described in the FY06 Action Plan are as follows:

- Provide TBRA for about 232 persons living with HIV/AIDS.
- Provide housing related emergency assistance to about 222 persons living with HIV/AIDS.
- Work with local health departments to obtain services through Ryan White and other funds.
- Enhance the capacity of service providers to link with other agencies and strengthen the effectiveness of their programs.
- Monitor activities to ensure efficient program operation and administration, coordination with other agencies and timely expenditure of HOPWA funds.
- Each HOPWA agency will assist participants move toward self-sufficiency by providing referrals to job training and rehabilitation programs.

The Suburban Maryland jurisdictions administer TBRA programs. All rental units in Suburban Maryland are available to individuals with HIV/AIDS as long as the rents are reasonable as defined by the HUD Fair Market Rents (FMRs) and as required by Federal HOPWA regulations. The most common type of housing units available for rent in Suburban Maryland are apartments in small and large apartment buildings and complexes, single family homes and town homes.





In FY2006, 216 of the 454 number of units projected for TBRA and STRMU payments were actually supported with HOPWA funds for the purpose of providing assistance or residential support to persons with HIV/AIDS and their families; 155 were Rental Assistance units and 61 were for Short-term/Emergency Housing Payments. (See Performance Charts below.)

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN MARYLAND						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	155	\$1,410,999	0	0	0	155
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	61	\$164,138	0	0	0	61
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	216	\$1,575,137	0	0	0	216
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	216	\$1,575,137	0	0	0	216

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions and Actual Accomplishments SUBURBAN MARYLAND		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	240	155
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	60	61
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	300	216
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	300	216

Suburban Maryland includes Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.  
All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration.

While expanding housing resources for this special population, the Counties also provide clients access to health-care and other services offered through the Ryan White Care Act and other



programs. Suburban Maryland jurisdictions operate HOPWA programs in collaboration with the nonprofit organizations that help clients meet the daily needs for housing, mental health, substance abuse and other supportive services. Each HOPWA agency assists participants move toward self-sufficiency by providing referrals to job training and rehabilitation programs. All of the HOPWA agencies in Suburban Maryland participate in their respective County's Continuum of Care Plan. The priorities and allocations of the Suburban Maryland region correlate with those of the Washington, D.C. Eligible Metropolitan Area.

### Suburban Virginia

During this period, NVRC expended approximately \$835,573 using primarily HOPWA FY2006. Ninety-five (95) HOPWA households maintained stable, independent housing through participation with one of the contracted TBRA providers. At the conclusion of the report period, one TBRA vendor is embarking on a regional rental assistance program. Heretofore, TBRA was provided by city/county housing offices whose programs were confined to the geographic boundaries of their jurisdictions.

Two families participated in the two slots of transitional housing services that were purchased with a previous year's HOPWA funds. Eight (8) households use the rental set aside program.

One hundred fifty-eight (158) HOPWA eligible households received short-term assistance with rent, mortgage or utilities from one vendor. A more vigilant focus on HOPWA being the funding of last resort and HIV-relatedness of claims has reduced the number of payments made under this category over those paid last year.

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN VIRGINIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	95	\$695,025	0	0	0	95
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	158	\$133,429	0	0	0	158
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	12	\$7,119	0	0	0	12
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	265	\$835,573	0	0	0	265
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	265	\$835,573	0	0	0	265



Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions and Actual Accomplishment SUBURBAN VIRGINIA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	176	95
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	290	158
3-a. Units with operating costs	12	12
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	464	265
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	464	265

Note: Suburban Virginia includes the counties of Arlington, Clarke, Fairfax, Fauquier, King George, Loudoun, Prince William, Spotsylvania, Stafford and Warren; as well as the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas and Manassas Park. All data provided by the DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration

A variety of support services complemented the Northern Virginia HOPWA housing offerings. Supportive services funds underwrote programming for the tenants of the region's only AIDS residence, including support for a highly-participatory tenants' council. Transportation to medical and key social service appointments, food vouchers, and entitlements counseling were also funded. The HIV Resources Project, housed at NVRC, continues to provide web-based information resources on housing and other services important to HOPWA-eligible persons. The HIV Resources Project receives about 950 inquiries per month.

Rental costs and vacancy rates have moderated somewhat in Northern Virginia over the previous report period, making it a little easier for HOPWA-eligible people to identify appropriate housing.

## West Virginia

In West Virginia, the AIDS Network has continued a cooperative relationship with local and state HOPWA organizations. The HOPWA case manager is a member of the Homeless Coalition of the Eastern Panhandle. However, homeless services offered in Jefferson County are very limited. Transportation in Jefferson County remains a barrier to access services.

Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN WEST VIRGINIA						
Type of Unit	Number of units with HOPWA funds	Amount of HOPWA funds	Number of units with Grantee and other funds	Amount of Grantee and other funds	Deduction for units reported in more than one column	TOTAL by type of unit
1. Rental Assistance	8	\$48,499	0	0	0	8
2. Short-term/emergency housing payments	12	22,329.00	0	0	0	0
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital	0	0	0	0	0	0



Performance Chart 1—Actual Performance Types of Housing Units which were Supported during the Operating Year. SUBURBAN WEST VIRGINIA						
costs and opened and served clients						
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	8	\$	0	0	0	8
Deduction for units reported in more than one category	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8	\$71,828	0	0	0	8

Performance Chart 2— Comparison to Planned Actions to Actual Accomplishments SUBURBAN WEST VIRGINIA		
Type of Unit	Estimated Number of Units by type in the approved Consolidate Plan/Action Plan for this operating year	Comment, on comparison with Actual Accomplishments (or attach)
1. Rental Assistance	8	8
2. Short-term or emergency housing payments	12	0
3-a. Units in facilities supported with operating funds.	0	0
3-b. Units in facilities that were developed with capital costs and opened and served clients.	0	0
3-c. Units in facilities being developed with capital costs but not yet opened.	0	0
Subtotal	35	8
Deduction for units reported in more than one category.	0	0
TOTAL	35	8

Suburban West Virginia includes Jefferson County.

All data provided by DC Department of Health, HIV/AIDS Administration.

## B. Barriers Encountered and Recommendations for Program Improvement

### District of Columbia:

In the District, the most significant obstacles remain:

- The lack of affordable housing due to the steady increase in housing costs,
- Difficulty accessing permanent housing opportunities upon transition out of the HOPWA housing continuum, and
- The need for a more cohesive reporting of Tenant-Based Rental Assistance from the jurisdictions.

#### Recommendations:

1. Continue to utilize the Gatekeeper to outreach to and identify potential housing units and unit holders.
2. Continue monthly networking meetings with AHPP-funded providers to implement identified methodologies for the transition of PWAs out of the TBRA continuum. These methods include, but are not limited to, the following:



- Continue the use of housing specific case managers who are assigned to each District of Columbia TBRA provider to assist clients with effective implementation and follow-up of housing plans;
  - Identify the available housing options for transition of PWAs to more permanent housing such as Section 8, Elderly 202, public housing for the long-term or 811;
  - Explore and implement referral and follow-up to educational and job-training programs; and
  - Work with housing provider network sub-committee to develop a triage protocol for housing.
3. Develop and implement a plan to broaden the District's Gate Keeper to service the entire EMA. This program has been very instrumental in the intake and tracking of each and every TBRA, Supportive and STRMU recipient of housing services in the District. The result will be centralized registration of each client in the EMA, which will assist AHPP with fiscal accountability, reporting and tracking.

### **Suburban Maryland**

The primary obstacle facing HOPWA participants in Suburban Maryland is the scarcity of affordable housing. The supply of affordable rental units is very limited. Declines in vacancy rates and increases in average rents create an affordability barrier for residents. Individuals who do not receive rent subsidy have difficulty finding appropriate places to live. Apartments in the Suburban Maryland region are too expensive for many low-income residents. Renters in this region often incur housing cost burdens.

#### **Recommendations:**

Because of the program's high degree of confidentiality, barriers and obstacles facing persons with AIDS are generally not due to AIDS but to other social issues. Common factors are discrimination based on race; bad credit history, family size and the number of children in the household.

The Prince George's County Housing Authority (PGHA) as the administrative agent for Suburban Maryland has designed its Strategic Housing Plan for individuals and families with HIV/AIDS to protect them from being evicted from their homes and from having their utilities disconnected. Emergency financial assistance and rental subsidies through the HOPWA program are offered to individuals and families living in shelters or who are in imminent danger of becoming homeless. Participants get help finding places to live near health clinics; public transportation and other needed services.

The Suburban Maryland program will continue to provide TBRA to persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. It is projected that the need for services will continue to increase as the life span of persons living with HIV/AIDS continues to extend. Housing providers have changed the priority from helping people at the end of their lives to assisting them transition to living with a chronic illness. Many Suburban Maryland persons with HIV/AIDS are living in family units. Every effort must be made to stabilize currently adequate living conditions to prevent homelessness and premature placement of dependent children into foster care.

The remaining gap in services is seeking additional funding through federal, state and local resources.



## Suburban Virginia

Although conditions have eased somewhat, Northern Virginia is still an expensive place to live. The demand for HOPWA-assisted housing still exceeds the supply; the region has a waiting list of about 60 persons with HIV/AIDS. Subcontracting delays early in Year 14 have led to delays and reimbursement from the Grantee to the Administrative Agent, and have caused most vendors to cut back on service provision. It is hoped that once reimbursements begin to be made more routinely that service will pick up.

### Recommendations:

- Continue to offer information on other housing assistance programs to PWAs, via the HIV Resources Project and other resources to help those on the waiting list find other housing options.
- Support state and local initiatives to increase the supply of affordable housing in the region. For example: this past year the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors approved designation of a portion of the real estate tax collected in the county, estimated at \$16 million annually, for development of affordable housing.

## West Virginia

There continues to be a lack of appropriate and affordable housing, especially in Jefferson County. There is also a lack of public and affordable private transportation for clients residing in Jefferson County who need to make scheduled appointments or travel for employment. The Martinsburg Housing Authority has closed its waiting list and has not taken application for Section 8 for over one year. Clients who do qualify for Section 8 have been unable to receive assistance through the program. Additionally, the subsidized housing units in Jefferson County have waiting lists from three months to one year. It is even longer for families with children. There are no homeless shelters available in Jefferson County. Because of the competition from Northern Virginia residents relocating to Jefferson County, there is a lack of safe, affordable and appropriate housing in that county for clients living on a low income.

### Recommendations:

West Virginia has expanded the transportation assistance to assist clients in accessing HIV-related services located in Berkeley County. The availability of transportation has assisted in the ability to provide housing assistance to clients in the Jefferson County area.

## 5.3 Program Monitoring

All housing providers submit monthly programmatic reports that detail the number of clients served/housed, support services provided, demographics information, and type of unit leased. They also include a narrative report that indicates the accomplishments and barriers identified for that month. The Administration for HIV Policy and Programs has revised the monthly programmatic reports to include annual activities for data entry into IDIS. An IDIS Data Guidebook has been developed especially for the Washington, DC EMSA Program to facilitate the data collection process. The guidebook explains in detail, the IDIS data structure, HOPWA activity definitions, methodology for collection of accomplishment and beneficiary data, and field definitions for the various types of HOPWA data collection worksheets.





## Chapter 6 SPECIAL INITIATIVES

### 6.1 Non-Homeless Special Needs

DHCD makes every effort to serve the diverse elements of its population through the projects it funds. DHCD requires that its funded projects be barrier-free housing, and it has earmarked local HPTF monies to ensure that purpose. Table 20 shows the number of units funded by household income level, for special needs, and for seniors.

Eight Projects funded under DFD project funding by DHCD in FY2006 were for special needs and/or seniors.

These include:

1. Hope and a Home Housing —14 units of transitional housing,
2. 1724 Minnesota Avenue SE — 6 units of special needs housing for persons with mental challenges,
3. Freedom House —30 units of transitional housing,
4. Piney Branch House —6 units of special needs housing for persons with mental challenges,
5. Veterans Center Annex Renovation —16 units of transitional housing,
6. Carver Seniors Apartments —103 units of affordable senior apartments
7. Arthur Capper Senior II Apartments — 138 units of affordable senior apartment units, and
8. Victory Housing —75 units of affordable senior apartment units.

**Table 21: FY2006 DFD Units Funded: By Income Level and Special Needs**

FUNDING CATEGORY	SPECIAL NEEDS	EXTREMELY LOW \$26,100 (0-30%)	VERY-LOW \$43,500 (31-50%)	LOW-INCOME \$52,200 (51-60%)	LOW-MOD \$68,300 (61-80%)	SENIOR
LIHTC	0	0	0	0	0	0
HPTF	50	410	81	0	41	103
CDBG	22	644	245	184	81	138
HOME	0	0	40	60	0	75
Totals:	72	1054	366	244	122	316

Note: See also section (P71) on ESG/Continuum of Care for additional units assisted by DHCD funding.

Income Limits based on: Household income for 4-person household as used in the RFP for FY2006 project funding; Individual programs have specific income levels which are used for that funding source.

### 6.2 New Communities Initiative

To attack the underlying conditions that contribute to poverty and crime, the District has refocused its resources in the “New Communities Initiative”. The initiative is aimed at interrupting cycles of joblessness, crime, and physical deterioration by re-building the physical, educational, social and economic underpinnings of an entire geographic area, with the participation of the local residents, the business community, and District government. The goal is to retain current residents while bringing in new residents in a mixed-income environment. This initiative is initially funded through securitization of \$12 million from the DC Housing Production Trust Fund. The first three neighborhoods selected are Northwest One, Barry Farm, and Lincoln Heights. Community planning has begun and a draft concept plan was prepared for each neighborhood.



## **A. Selecting Communities**

In selecting neighborhoods as “New Communities”, the District looked at those with the most critical needs; areas that are experiencing both high crime and high levels of poverty. Government, consultants and residents of affected communities jointly identified specific actions needed and develop revitalization plans that take a comprehensive approach to solutions.

## **B. Planning: Identifying Assets and Needs**

In developing each Community Plan with residents and stakeholders, the District undertake neighborhood asset mapping. This includes surveying families to assess skill levels; determining needs for education, job training, small business development and childcare; and assessing needs for physical health services, mental health services and other family support services. The District also performs market analysis of the areas, including rent, subsidies, occupancy rates, and amenities for multi-family rental and for-sale housing. The analysis reviews supply and demand for commercial and community space, and the ability of the community to absorb market units with affordable units.

## **C. Action and Financial Plans**

After analysis of community needs, the District prepared an action plan and financial plan for each targeted community. These plans address not only physical redevelopment needs, but also the needs of the area’s “human capital”. These plans are specific, with timetables and identified resources. The financial plan assigns responsibility and sources of funding for carrying out the community’s renewal plan. These plans are discussed with the affected communities and the obligations and responsibilities of individuals and organizations are identified.

## **D. Relocation Strategy**

If a community’s plan calls for demolition or renovation of existing housing, a relocation plan will be developed for each property, and residents will be advised of their options. Housing will be replaced unit for unit, but not necessarily on the same property. A mixture of income levels will be sought to create a more diverse neighborhood, attract commerce, and generate tax revenue to help pay for improvements and services.

## **E. Development Plan**

All the desired actions and strategies are collected along with implementation recommendations to form the final development plan. The District uses this development plan to carry out both short term and long term re-development of the target communities.

## **F. Sites and Prioritization**

New Communities either incorporate or are contiguous with target areas listed in previous Action Plans and in the Five-Year Plan. DHCD has listed target areas and “hot spot” crime focus areas where it has provided incentives for re-development. There are approximately 5 sites in Wards 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8 that meet the criteria established for Renewal Communities. They are located in either



an existing target area or abutting one. All city target areas are included in DHCD's competitive funding processes.

### G. Prioritization Criteria:

Sample criteria that could be used to select priority "New Community" sites are:

1. **Immediate Need for Action:** Is the community facing pressures that require immediate action to ensure the preservation of affordable housing? For example, are there multiple, pending Federal actions that will terminate contracts on affordable housing properties? Is there an immediate loss of subsidized housing? Is there a concentration of Housing Choice Voucher Program (formerly Section 8) properties on annual contracts that owners are planning to terminate?
2. **Impact:** Will the revitalization of the community allow for large-scale preservation of affordable housing? Will it allow for large-scale production of new affordable units? A neighborhood may provide the opportunity immediate impact--it may act as a catalyst for broader revitalization, or could address a single, blighted community in an otherwise unstable community.
3. **Availability of Adjacent Parcels:** Are there a number of adjacent sites/parcels that can support redevelopment? These may be privately owned sites/parcels, or sites/parcels held by a government entity, nonprofit, D.C. Public Schools, or National Capital Revitalization Corporation. The District may not necessarily need to purchase these parcels, but it may be able to influence redevelopment through the planning process.
4. **Local Site Control and Ability to Acquire:** Does the District have control over parcels that would be critical to the success of a redevelopment initiative; or how difficult would acquisition to vital properties become?

This is an ambitious plan and will require a long-term commitment of resources and effort. The strategy will be under the direction of the City Administrator, and coordinated through the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, with the Offices Neighborhood Services and Planning. The District estimates that total development costs could reach \$3 billion.

### 6.3 Performance Measurement

The District takes Performance Measurement seriously. Performance measures are part of all Agency Directors' employment contracts with the Mayor, and they are evaluated each year in writing and in a direct conference with the Mayor. In turn, within the agency, the measures for each program/division become part of Division Directors' performance plans and part of the annual evaluation process.

The measurement system enables the Director to know on a monthly basis the productivity of the Department and its progress in meeting spending plans and program commitments to HUD and to the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia. The system provides a color-coded view of trend analysis so that managers can get a quick update on the status of measures. DHCD has a



Mission Statement, goals and objectives and performance measures for each housing and community development program area. Program managers/division directors are provided with a quarterly analysis of their progress toward goals and required to explain lagging goals, as well as to recommend strategies and/or resources needed to meet any unmet obligations. This data collection and monitoring system provides a basis for managers to make course corrections in light of unforeseen circumstances, and to anticipate changes needed in program design, funding or operations. DHCD's performance targets are submitted as part of the Annual Action Plans and results are reported in the annual CAPER reports.

The Performance Measurement System has three overarching objectives: (1) Creating Suitable Living Environments, (2) Providing Decent Affordable Housing, and (3) Creating Economic Opportunities. There are also three outcomes under each objective: (1) Availability/Accessibility, (2) Affordability, and (3) Sustainability. Thus, the three objectives, each having three possible outcomes, will produce nine possible "outcome/objective statement in HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) by entering data in the form of output indicators. The below chart illustrates the Outcome framework making links between Objectives, Outcomes and the 9 Outcome Statements.

	Outcome #1 Availability/Accessibility	Outcome #2 Affordability	Outcome #3 Sustainability
Objective #1 Suitable Living Environment	Enhance <u>Suitable Living Environment</u> Through Improved/New <u>Accessibility</u>	Enhance <u>Suitable Living Environment</u> Through Improved/New <u>Affordability</u>	Enhance <u>Suitable Living Environment</u> Through Improved/New <u>Sustainability</u>
Objective #2 Decent Housing	Create <u>Decent Housing</u> with Improved/New <u>Availability</u>	Create <u>Decent Housing</u> with Improved/New <u>Affordability</u>	Create <u>Decent Housing</u> with Improved/New <u>Sustainability</u>
Objective #3 Economic Opportunity	Provide <u>Economic Opportunity</u> Through Improved/New <u>Accessibility</u>	Provide <u>Economic Opportunity</u> Through Improved/New <u>Affordability</u>	Provide <u>Economic Opportunity</u> Through Improved/New <u>Sustainability</u>

## 6.4 Outcome Measures

DHCD has developed outcome measure indicators which will relate to an improved quality of life for program participants, improved quality of local housing stock, and revitalization of neighborhoods. Our outcome measurements are identified in the Table 23 below, and show how DHCD program measures relate to HUD parameters for measuring outcomes.

**Table 22: Performance and Outcome Measurement**

HUD OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	DHCD PROGRAM	OUTCOME	MEASUREMENT
Suitable Living Environment	Number of housing units assisted that have eliminated at least one significant health and safety deficiency	DFD Project Financing—Rental Housing Rehab Program	<i>Over the next year, several units of affordable housing will be brought up to DC building Code standards. The annual output objective is 1,800 units at</i>	Actual number of units of affordable housing financed and brought up to DC building code standards will be measured against a



HUD OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	DHCD PROGRAM	OUTCOME	MEASUREMENT
			<i>DC Code standards. Units will be in targeted neighborhoods throughout the District to increase stability and revitalization.</i>	Dept. of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs database of DC total housing unit code deficiencies and be expressed as a percentage of reduction.
Suitable Living Environment	Units provided with financing for the correction of documented housing code violations and other health and safety threats.	Homeownership Promotion and Preservation, Single-Family Residential Rehab Program	<i>Stable housing is preserved for low/moderate income homeowners as 50% of eligible homeowners complete the necessary steps to obtain District rehabilitation financing to correct housing code violations and other threats to personal health and safety.</i>	Ratio of Single Family Rehab applications approved by loan committee to total number of rehabilitation projects financed by loans and/or grants.
Suitable Living Environment	Reduction in derelict properties as a result of acquisition, demolition or rehabilitation and increased neighborhood stability.	DFD Financing, TPAP, tenant purchase program	<i>Rental housing will be returned to DC code standards and homeownership will be increased by assisting 150 tenant-households to purchase and own these units. Units will be in targeted neighborhoods throughout the District.</i>	Number of families successfully purchasing the buildings they live in.
Affordable Housing through funding	% increase in homeownership rate in targeted neighborhoods or community overall.	HPAP, first-time homeowner loans	<i>City-wide proportion of low-Moderate-income homeowner households to renter households is increased, as 30% of all low/mod-income renters receiving Notice of Eligibility for DC funded homebuyer assistance settle homebuyer loans.</i>	Ratio of all applicants obtaining Notices of Eligibility for first-time homebuyer assistance to total number of households purchasing homes with DC homebuyer assistance.
Economic Opportunity	Neighborhood Based Activity	Commercial Corridor Development and Technical Assistance	<i>Small businesses in expanding commercial corridors become more competitive and are stabilized against possible displacement as 90% of businesses presenting receive assistance developing marketing efforts, business plans, certifications, etc. which increase their opportunities to be self-sustaining.</i>	Ratio of all small businesses that seek technical assistance from grantee agencies to total number of small businesses actually provided such services by grantee agencies. This excludes businesses that do not keep scheduled appointments.



HUD OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	DHCD PROGRAM	OUTCOME	MEASUREMENT
Suitable Living Environment	Neighborhood Based Activity	Housing Counseling Program	<i>Households with active or potential housing crises have housing situations stabilized, as 90% of households seeking assistance receive counseling, information about affordable housing and/or access to District housing assistance programs.</i>	Ratio of all households requesting appointments for counseling services** with grantee agencies to all households that receive face-to-face counseling. **excluding households that do not keep scheduled appointments.
Ending and preventing chronic homelessness	End and prevent chronic homelessness in DC by 2014	ESG support for Shelter Operations, emergency grants, and shelter bed renovations	<i>No fewer than 45 families will be housed each month in suitable living space; Households will be stabilized and prevented from becoming homeless and Homeless persons will be provided safe, sanitary and decent living conditions.</i>	Actual number of families/individuals assisted each month; number of beds renovated.